CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH MEETING

HELD AT CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE, Marconi Station Area, Park Headquarters, South Wellfleet, Massachusetts, on Monday, September 13, 2010, commencing at 1:06 p.m.

SITTING:

Richard Delaney, Chairman
Brenda J. Boleyn, Vice Chairman
Richard Philbrick
Peter Watts
Ed Sabin
William Hammatt
Judith Stephenson
Edgar Francis

William Clark, alternate
Tom Reinhart, Wellfleet alternate

Also present:

George Price, Superintendent
Sue Moynihan, Chief of Interpretation and Cultural
Resources
Lauren McKean, Management Assistant
Shelley Hall, Park
Mary Hake, Biologist
Megan Tyrrell, Presenter

Audience members

LINDA M. CORCORAN
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
P. O. Box 4
Kingston, Massachusetts 02364
(781) 585-8172

I N D E X

<u>Pa</u>	<u>ige</u>
Adoption of Agenda	3
Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting (7-19-10)	3
Reports of Officers	4
Reports of Subcommittees	
Superintendent's Report	4 4 6 7 13 13 25 26 26 26 27 731 29
Old Business	40
New Business	40
Date and Agenda for Next Meeting	44
Public Comment	56
Adjournment	75
Reporter's Certificate	77

	-
1	<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>
2	MR. DELANEY: Good afternoon, everyone. Happy to
3	call the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission
4	275th meeting to order.
5	
6	ADOPTION OF AGENDA
7	MR. DELANEY: We have an agenda that's been
8	distributed in advance and unless I hear recommendations
9	for additions or changes, I will ask for a motion to
10	adopt it as printed.
11	MS. BOLEYN: So moved.
12	MS. STEPHENSON: Second.
13	MR. DELANEY: All in favor?
14	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
15	MR. DELANEY: Good. Carries.
16	APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING
17	<u>(JULY 19, 2010)</u>
18	MR. DELANEY: We just actually have just received
19	today the Minutes of our previous meeting of July 19th,
20	so we were not able to distribute those in advance. I
21	would like to ask your indulgence to postpone that

discussion and adoption to the next meeting.

So moved.

MR. WATTS:

MR. DELANEY: So moved.

23

	-
1	BOARD MEMBERS: Second.
2	MR. DELANEY: All in favor?
3	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
4	MR. DELANEY: I'll move to report of the officers.
5	REPORTS OF OFFICERS
6	MR. DELANEY: Any officer like to report on anything?
7	MS. BOLEYN: No report, thank you.
8	REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES
9	MR. DELANEY: Okay, a report from subcommittees.
10	No. Okay. Thank you.
11	SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT
12	MR. DELANEY: Superintendent's report.
13	Superintendent Price.
14	UPDATE ON DUNE SHACK AND REPORT
15	MR. PRICE: Sure. First I was just an update on the
16	dune shacks. In your packets we've given you a hard copy
17	of the revised plan that you all voted on in July with
18	your additions. So this is the Preservation and Use
19	Plan/Environmental Assessment for the Dune Shacks at the
20	Peaked Hill Bar Historic District. This is also now on
21	the website.
22	I also included a memo from MADE, which Mr. Chair,
23	I'm going to be sending out to the Advisory Commission
24	subcommittee members. Initially when we were having

our meetings I had said that we wanted to get through all the recommendations, turn it into an EA and then I was fully expecting we were going to have another round of public meetings, a comment in "the fall". That schedule however changed once we moved so far into the summer with the July meeting. So then I was being told my choices were either to have public meetings Christmas week or postpone to the spring because we're dealing with other subcontractors. So we've opted for the spring. So this is going to delay it a little bit, but you know, we've received some public comment that people don't appreciate doing things in the dead of winter on the Cape. So we'll try to do an April/May time frame where it will be early enough for people and not come up into the summer business after the majority of the fall.

So this is now, Sue, on the website?

MS. MOYNIHAN: I believe it is, yes.

MR. PRICE: You can view it that way, but I also wanted to make sure you had a hard copy.

MS. BOLEYN: Thank you.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PRICE: We certainly appreciated you folks having a July meeting which is not normal for this group to codify that work. I think the subcommittee did a fantastic job.

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

MR. PHILBRICK: Is that contract still running?

MR. PRICE: Yes. Pardon, the contract? Do you remember Sandy Hamilton who came out for a number of the meetings from Denver. She was the one who was in charge of our environmental assessment program. In fact, she was at this meeting. And she has a subcontract group who is actually now terming it from the document we produced into the environmental assessment. So there will be no substantive change, but there will be a way for them to tee up the alternatives and have it become as a public discussion.

MR. PHILBRICK: Thank you.

IMPROVED PROPERTIES/TOWN BYLAWS

MR. PRICE: The next topic was improved properties. Lauren put together some notes for me and just wanted to report the Wellfleet Planning Board is developing zoning bylaws parameters for the scale of construction in residential areas outside the Park for spring Town Meeting. So if you recall during all of our zoning discussions, Peter and the subcommittee that came up with the bylaws for Town Meeting for that, it specifically involved the Seashore District. So now they're taking a look, as we understand it, at a broader approach, which we appreciate.

1 MR. WATTS: Does it say s

MR. WATTS: Does it say spring, it doesn't say fall?

MR. PRICE: As we understand, it will be a spring

Town Meeting?

1.3

MR. REINHART: It's still up in the air. They decided last week not to have a fall Town Meeting, but now there's other issues that are coming up. So it could be very well back on. We're going to talk about it tonight -- or tomorrow at the Selectmen's meeting.

MR. PRICE: And obviously we've still been working Ed, with our Truro compatriots on any improvements they might be interested to make in the Town of Truro. Let's put it this way, improvements that we would like or that we would think that would be improvements. It's all a matter of perspective.

HERRING RIVER WETLAND RESTORATION

MR. PRICE: Just under the Herring River Wetland
Restoration, I just wanted to mention that the Seashore
staff is continuing to work with the extended committee
on the prep of the EIS/EIR for the spring. I also
included, if you haven't seen it in your package, a flyer
that the Friends of the Herring River Restoration project
distributed in August. I think that's really a nice
update. Take a look at that at your leisure.

MR. DELANEY: Peter.

MR. WATTS: I've been working with John Portnoy and Mark Adams and I'm doing a four foot by five foot painting of the area that's represented here. And I think it's going to be used for educational purposes that describes the 100 year flood and as areas that will be under water at any given time or perhaps 20 years in the future.

MR. PRICE: Just as a followup report, I actually participated in the Seashore District Wellfleet residents meeting in July, I think Megan you were there. And we talked a little bit about the effects of climate change. And we have seen it with the maps that have been developed. It's certainly pretty telling. And recently I also participated in a meeting related to Sea Level Rise with five regional directors of federal agencies including the National Park Service and NOA and USGS. And all these federal agencies have tried to work programs around the effects of climate change and sea level rise into the future because it's going to affect so many of our nation's resources, that's for sure.

And the new MMS -- after the oil spill, MMS is now BOEM.

MS. STEPHENSON: Standing for?

MR. PRICE: Bureau of -- it's Ocean's -- I have

1 the -

MR. DELANEY: It's Management of Energy -

MR. PRICE: Offshore Energy and Regulation.

MR. DELANEY: It's way too long, whatever it is.

(Off the record discussion)

MR. PRICE: But apparently their name is changing as we speak.

MS. BOLEYN: So don't memorize this one yet.

MR. PRICE: Yes. But it used to be MMS. The reason all these five agencies have gotten together is because as Department of Interior, as they say, we're basically responsible for the Continental Divide to the Continental Shelf. So depending upon which agency you're talking about, it really covers the broad spectrum. So that's why the DYA agencies are trying to work more and more closely together.

And the answer is....The Bureau of Ocean Energy
Management, Regulation, and Enforcement. How about that?
BOEM.

MS. BOLEYN: BOEM?

MR. PRICE: BOEM.

MS. BOLEYN: BOEM, okay.

MR. PRICE: That's probably going to change as well, but...

Actually, Mr. Chair, I hate to do digressions. It's not like me, but...

Specifically, I also participated in the most recent offshore wind task force that they are participating in.

This BOEM group was charged with taking a look at the Continental Shelf. I believe I've mentioned this -- I know I've mentioned it in previous Advisory Commission meetings. And there's a large group that has met numerous times under the auspices of Massachusetts Task Force on Wind Energy, and specifically they're taking a look at large sections -- about 12 miles south of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard. And it's 25 nautical miles that they're actually looking at as potential places for industrial scale wind turbines.

They're also combining efforts with the State of Rhode Island on that area as well because there's a certain amount of overlap. So that's a pretty big deal. I'm not sure how much press that has all received yet, but I know it's a big task force, that's for sure. And they're in the final throws of finishing a RFI, request for interest, that would have it be published in federal register and to see if there's any commercial outfits that would be interested in getting involved in that kind of scale with wind energy projects.

1 MR. DELANEY: George.

1.3

MR. PHILBRICK: And the definition of the shelf, is there any maximum depth?

MR. PRICE: Sixty meters. At this point 60 meters is a -

MR. PHILBRICK: 102. Okay.

MR. PRICE: Sixty meters is the depth of the current technology for them to be able to build these towers.

MR. WATTS: They don't talk about the bed at all?

MR. PRICE: No. This is offshore is what they're looking at. And they have basically have set up these task force -- basically from Maine down all the way to Florida with some states further ahead than Massachusetts than others.

MR. DELANEY: But this is federal waters, Peter.

MR. WATTS: Yes.

MR. DELANEY: The state meanwhile through it's State Ocean Engine plan, as you know has identified some potential sites in state waters. And then the third piece now is the Cape Cod Commission is currently undertaking a more detailed plan as part of the district of regional impact designation for Cape waters to specific sites along the shore of all of Cape Cod. So those are three different federal, state and regional

initiatives that are all going forward with some sort of ocean energy planning siting initiatives. And I think so far they all seem to be nested pretty well. The feds of course, offshore. The state has a major framework with some general ideas, and now the region is trying to hone in more detail working with towns. But that would potentially address Cape Cod Bay.

1.3

MR. PRICE: And it's appeared to me from my participation in this task force that the group has been very responsive. It takes over the conference room at Mass Maritime and there's a lot of members of the Boards of Selectmen from Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket show up in mass. The two federally recognized Indian tribes are there, a lot of state agencies. The County Commission is there. Congressman Delahunt's office was there. Sheila has actually been to most of the meetings, so, as the County Commissioner. So there's been a lot of participation. And I think frankly, they're going overboard compared to the -- maybe the Cape Wind experience.

They're looking at 12 miles out to minimize the views. They are going to put in a lot of natural resource indicators that they're aware of as far as whale migration routes at different times of the year. They're

talking about cultural resources. So a lot of the things we've asked about early on, they seem to be very responsive and we've appreciated that. And my participation in that is not as the Cape Cod National Seashore, but I'm representing the Regional Director for the Park Service on that, so it's a much larger framework. Okay.

1.3

WIND TURBINES/CELL TOWERS

MR. PRICE: On the wind turbines and cell towers, frankly, the only report we have is -- Did you know the FAA originally had denied our request to consider a wind turbine at the site. We sent in an appeal working with our consultants. And even though Lauren has been in communication with them, we have not received any information back. So we don't know what we would be talking about as far as a project is concerned. I know there's still a lot of interest in it.

Concerning wind turbines included in your package is any correspondence that we've received since the last meeting, so that you can certainly read it. If you have any additional questions, please let me know.

FLEXIBLE SHOREBIRD MANAGEMENT

One of the topics that we talked a lot about last winter season had to do with flexible shorebird

management. Obviously it became quite a hot topic when we were pursuing selected predator management under that. And we've asked Mary Hake to join us, she's our natural resource management specialist and basically heads up our Shorebird Management program to give us report as to how we did this season.

Mary.

MS. HAKE: Thanks, George. First I have to get a special guest. George wanted this dramatic entry.

(Presentation of the display of Sienna)

Welcome Sienna. Not a slick operation here, but this was something we had a lot of fun with this year. We had two student conservation association interns who were specifically doing interpretation of the shorebird program here. Since so much of the recovery of the shorebirds, piping plovers, Least Terns and oystercatchers is to educate the public. So we went to AC Moore and figured out how to make this large plover. But we had to name the piping plover. And over 800 people from all over the world thought up names for this. And this was stationed at the visitor's centers and on beaches. It was kind of a cool thing and people got a kick out of it. I feel like you can't see me with that bird, it's -- maybe someday they will get that big.

But anyway, just a really brief summary of this year's shorebird program. Shorebirds returned to the Cape around mid-March, which is what happened this year. And our first nests are usually around the third, fourth week in April, which is what happened. We had 84 pairs of plovers with 137 chicks. The productivity which is the number of chicks which actually fledged was for the Park, 1.61. Now that was 2.04 for the north district, two chicks -- 2.04 chicks in the north and only .97 in the south district. So the average was 1.61, which is pretty good. We had 115 nests that were laid. And the four main factors affecting the nest failure were predation, was number one. 84 percent of the nests that failed were due to predation, five percent overwash. didn't have any Noreasters this year. And four were sanded over -- four percent and four percent were abandoned. A total of 236 chicks were hatched, and of these, 137 fledged. The leading cause of nests loss to predation was American Crow, number one. 72 percent of all nests lost were due to -- excuse me. The leading cause of all nests lost to predation were American Crow and 72 percent of all these nests lost were to that. 20 percent were lost to unknown, predator, meaning that it was raining out, we couldn't figure out what actually

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

took them. Realize that these unknown predators are usually the same species as the known predator, and eight percent to coyote. There were no other predators to piping plovers that we could identify other than crows and coyotes. Crow tracks were constantly observed in the district, especially on the bay side of Wellfleet, Boundbrook, Duck Harbor and Great Island. Crows were also keying into exclosures. They would perch on the exclosures. When that happened we had to remove the exclosures, which then soon after we removed those exclosures often those nests were lost to crows within The other thing is we did see crows circling exclosures. And we had one case where plover chicks were hatching out and we saw crow tracks the next day and the chicks were gone, presumably taken by the crow. felt the impacts of crows more than Duck Harbor, this beach was one of the most productive beaches in the park. This year due to intense crow predation, not a single chick fledged from the five pairs that nested there.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

On to Lease Terns, they returned to the beaches around mid-May. The first nest was the end of May. And the last nest hatched the end of August. One of the things that happens with intense predation is that it prolongs the nesting season, which is what we saw with

both the plovers and the Lease Terns. We had a total of 226 nesting pairs in nine colonies throughout the Park, with the largest colony being at the Head of the Meadow. We had almost 100 pairs at the Head of the Meadow, which is a large colony these days for Lease Terns.

Unfortunately again, due to predator pressures of mainly coyotes, that colony did not produce much at all, I think

just a few individuals. Again, coyotes were the leading

predator among Lease Terns.

1.3

We had two pairs of American oyster catchers at Jeremy Point, they laid five nests and they re-nest a couple of times. Four of the nest were lost to coyote, one nest hatched and the next day the chicks were gone presumably to coyote.

We do monitor the number of dogs off-leash. Dogs are predator and they chase after these nesting shorebirds. We had a total of 446 observations of dogs off-leash.

As George mentioned the Flexible Shorebird

Management, we did get permission or permit from the Fish
and Wildlife Service to manage a very limited number of
beaches that have high visitation such as Marconi Beach.

We did have a nest within the Flexible Shorebird

Management area at Marconi Beach; a one egg nest where we

minimally protected the nest. This nest did eventually get washed over due to a storm.

Environmental education, again, we do a lot of that. We go to various schools early in the season. We talked to over 400 students. Barbara Dugan from the Interpretive Division is very helpful with that, as well as my shorebird SEA spoke to over 4,000 individuals about our shorebird program here.

Other than that, what I'm working on now is a comprehensive shorebird management plan, a beach management plan where everyone within the Park, all divisions is working on getting a plan together, discussing the management of the shorebirds in the Park and with the vision of working on NEPA compliance through an environmental assessment on shorebird selective predator management. So that will be coming down the pike this fall and winter.

Yes.

1.3

MR. WATTS: We went on a field trip this morning and Sue explained that a cage-like structure with a net that could be spread over the top -- how effective was that?

MS. HAKE: Well, those are the predator exclosures that have been used for about 20 years. And they're very effective in keeping predators out of eating the nests.

But what's happening because they've been used for so long, predators like crows have learned that inside that is food. So they key into those exclosures. So they're getting less and less effective. And in fact we get adult mortality -- plover mortality because some predators will kill them as they're getting out of those exclosures. So we're finding more and more negative factors associated with them. And what we find is when we don't use them, the chances of those eggs that need to be incubated for about 28 days to hatch, is almost nil because of the predator pressures. The artificial increased levels of predators that have increased in population due to their ability to adapt to humans and benefit. So things like crows have really benefitted putting an increase pressure on these species. they've worked well, we depend on them. We're exclosure junkies, but they definitely come with a cost.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. WATTS: So will you discontinue the use?

MS. HAKE: No, we will probably continue using them, but I think what we would like to do is incorporate some other means of predator management so that we don't solely depend on that. And realize that just protects the eggs from predators. Once the chicks were precocial, meaning they run around right after they're hatched;

nothing is protecting them from predators as it presently stands within the Park's management of the shorebirds.

MR. PRICE: And in fact there are other instances where some managers in other facilities decided to eliminate the exclosures and it basically wiped out their entire population. Again, because the predators had no barriers at all.

MS. HAKE: Yeah, that's what happened at Duck Harbor. They were keying into those exclosures and basically stopped using them because of concerns of adult mortality of the birds and the crows would just find the nests immediately.

MR. PRICE: So basically what -- one of the things
Mary just said was we're working on a more comprehensive
shorebird management plan which we will then present to
the public. Last year you all recall we were focused
specifically on the selective predator management piece
and received a lot of -- obviously it's a hot-button
issue to a lot of people. A lot of people have a lot of
concerns on it and specifically the humane society of the
U.S. was threatening legal action if we didn't have all
of our documents in place. And it wasn't that they were
adverse to actually elimination of the crows, it was just
that particular method as adopted by the USCA, the poison

egg method is what became such a controversial issue.

So in any case, I appreciate the fact that Mary was able to continue to work on this. Basically our season was okay. One of the things we're obligated to do with the protection of the shorebirds is to bring it up to a level that would be sustainable; that's the goal of the Protective Species program. So that we not only have a stable population, but we have a high productivity level. And it's at that point, ultimately over a period of time once you can demonstrate this, that then you can relax some of the strict guidance that we're under once it becomes potential for de-listing. And we're a ways to go from that. And right now because the productivity level is kind of leveled off, we need to take some action if we're going to really fulfill our mission of assisting these birds in the long-term.

MR. DELANEY: Other questions.

MR. FRANCIS: Yes, I think you mentioned that dogs off-leash were in the vicinity of 400 sightings.

MS. HAKE: That was just what my staff saw as they were monitoring the birds. Yeah, we keep weekly records of how many dogs off-leash that we see within the Park. And realize that because compliance was so poor, areas in front of where the shorebirds nest are actually closed to

pets now. That's not to say you know people comply with that. In general we get greater compliance with that, but people do tend to like to run their dogs on the beach. And I will say the law enforcement -- the Resource Protection Rangers did a really good job in trying to enforce dog off-leash regulations, but we're only out there a certain amount of time.

MR. FRANCIS: How are these off-leash regulations enforced?

MS. HAKE: Well, just by us being out there and if we see a dog off a leash, the biologist staff will just try to reason with people and get them to put their dog on a leash. The Resource Protection Rangers can issue citations. Dog off-leash are not allowed 365 days a year within the Park. Not just for the protection of shorebirds, but realize dogs bite people and that kind of stuff. So it's a regulation that's present throughout the year.

MR. PRICE: That's another emotional issue obviously. There's some people who are very passionate about their dogs and being able to run their dogs. If our people have identified over 400 dogs off-leash and we only have 80 sound nesting pairs totally. You know, that 160 some individual adult birds and yet we've had over 400 dogs

off-leash that we know of, not the ones that we don't know of. So obviously there's a -- again an imbalance that we have to stay on top of.

MS. HAKE: Yeah, and that does not even include the number of dogs we see on town property. This is just what we see on Park Service property, so... Like George says, times that by a fair number, this is a very conservative number.

MR. REINHART: Have these numbers been publicized because it is pretty striking you know in terms of the argument people had about -- you know, kind of softening the blow that crows have on shorebirds. This seems kind of a important to get out.

MS. HAKE: I think eventually it's going to be.

We're just now crunching the numbers. The season

basically ended. So it's just now that we're starting to

actually get all the numbers from both the north and

south district. But that's something I think we

eventually want to do.

MR. DELANEY: Dick.

MR. PHILBRICK: So I can get a better view of what's happening. That number of sightings is not necessarily all different dogs, certainly.

MS. HAKE: There may be some cases where there are

- dogs that we saw a couple times. But those are individual sightings.
 - MR. PHILBRICK: Only two?
 - MS. HAKE: No, there could be several instances where there may have been an offender that ran their dog and we observed that more than once in the season, but we did see -- whatever I said, 468 dogs off-leash this season.
 - MR. PHILBRICK: Those were the sightings.
- 9 MS. HAKE: Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

- MR. PHILBRICK: 468 sightings?
- 11 MS. HAKE: Yes, exactly.
- MR. PHILBRICK: So it may have been half that in number of dogs.
- MS. HAKE: No, each one of those numbers represents a dog that we saw off-leash. So there were -
- MR. PHILBRICK: So there may have been -
- MS. HAKE: No, they were -
- MS. HALL: But we don't know how many dogs it was.

 One dog might have been five observations out of five
- 20 different dates. That's true.
- MS. HAKE: Oh, you mean like if one dog we saw 468 times worth. Okay, got it.
- 23 MR. DELANEY: Okay, other questions to Mary.
- 24 MS. HAKE: Well, thank you for your interest and

1 stay tuned.

1.3

MR. DELANEY: Thank you.

MR. PRICE: Why don't you take Sienna with you.

MS. HAKE: Sienna is heavy.

MR. DELANEY: Who made her that heavy?

MS. HAKE: Well it's rebared legs. And the legs were a bit long. It makes you smile.

MR. DELANEY: There are three other eggs in that box too - big eggs actually.

Okay continue on with the Superintendent's report, please.

HIGHLANDS CENTER UPDATE

MR. PRICE: On the Highlands Center Update. Just wanted to mention that if you haven't been up to the Highland Center in a while, I suggest you do. So Lauren has been working with a volunteer group with MARCOR over the last couple of seasons. This particular year, not only did they do a lot of landscaping, but they did some minor improvements to some of the facilities as well as a couple of amazing murals that are done. And I think the kids had a great time. And we had a Highlands Fest Day with the grand opening of these murals. So I think it looks a lot better than it did, that's for sure.

ALTERNATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

1.3

MR. PRICE: On alternate transportation, we continue to submit project proposals through our system in collaboration with the county. We work very closely with Clay Schofield and the County Commissioners on our middles, but we have a number in the hopper now. And we'll be continuing to work on that.

OTHER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

MR. PRICE: We're in the process of finalizing the Moors Road construction in that I believe Forest actually was working with out-contracting officer last Tuesday. Bids came in and we're going through the process of finalizing the bids for Moors Road. We feel very good about that project.

HERRING COVE BEACH FACILITIES

MR. PRICE: Herring Cove is also moving along. We've had a number of meetings with the towns. We've had a public meetings up at the Center for Coastal Studies and they're coming up with the first round of proposals. Basically, if you think of Herring Cove now, it's primarily just like one large block of a building built in the 1950's with the concession building and an ancillary garage. The design that looks like we'll be moving forward with would be a collection of smaller

buildings that would serve purposes of changing -- a changing room, a restroom, a concession facility, a lifeguard facility, storage, that sort of thing. So to make it a little bit more of a village concept with boardwalks. So it would still be very low key and it would blend into the environment. And the goal of this is that these would not be trailers or immediately portable, but they would be able to be movable buildings. So that say in 20 years time, if the coastline changed again and things were going to be affected to the point where they were going to be in danger, we wouldn't have to demolish those structures and rebuild them. We could actually dismantle them and relocate them. So that's the concept with that. We feel very good about that. So that's still in that preliminary design stage.

The next thing that has to happen with that in November is that I will be going with our Denver connections to the Design Advisory Board for the National Park Service and basically propose this as a project before it becomes a real project. So that's the very next step.

CAPE WIDE BIKE PLANNING

MR. PRICE: On the Cape wide bike planning, basically a couple of things. First of all, our good bike planning

buddy, Clay has been sidelined, he had surgery on his foot this summer. So I know he's been out of commission for most of the time. But basically we've met with Carst Hoganbloom on our staff who's continuing to meet with some of the local committees, met specifically with Truro/Provincetown a number of times about brainstorming about the possibility of extending the rail trail with the rail trail concept through some of their towns. And also met with Mass. Department of Transportation. And will be setting up additional meetings in Boston with Mass. DOT later in the fall once Clay is able to get up and around.

Already mentioned about the Herring Cove Beach.

CLIMATE FRIENDLY PARKS

The next presentation that we would like to spend a little bit of time on has to do with our Climate Friendly Parks Program.

MS. STEPHENSON: Could I just interrupt. Since we were talking visitors centers and buildings, what if anything is happening at the Eastham Visitors Center of the Native Americans.

- MR. PRICE: Actually, we can give you an update.
- 23 MS. STEPHENSON: Were you planning to do that later?
- 24 MR. PRICE: I actually was not.

1.3

MS. STEPHENSON: Oh, okay.

1.3

SALT POND VISITOR CENTER

MR. PRICE: I wasn't thinking of doing that, but
....What Judy's talking about. We mentioned this in the
past that we were working on two exhibit pieces at the
Salt Pond Visitor's Center. One, was the replacement for
the center of the rotunda area in the lobby. There had
been a kind of a very large map mostly about the Gulf of
Maine, that didn't survive the reconstruction of the
visitor center. And then the other was another museum
piece in the museum itself. And our observation was that
we were very light on the Native American story in that
visitor center. And it was our intent to elaborate on
that story a little bit. And I know Sue has been working
with the contractors with that piece.

Sue Moynihan, our chief interpretation and cultural resources.

MS. MOYNIHAN: Yes, the project will be complete in February. Right now we're reviewing the pre-production documents which is all of texts, all of the graphics, how everything is going to look, the particular font, the point size, everything. On the museum exhibit which I think is specific entrance area, we've been consulting with the Mashpee Wampanoag and the Aquinnah Wampanoag

tribes. We have consultants from both those tribes who have been reviewing everything as we've gone along both from just the topic standpoints, looking to the bias and stereotypes, putting us in contact with people who have images. And right now they're helping us conduct eight world history interviews. One addition to the exhibit that we made was an opportunity for the native people to tell their story in their own words. So we have eight 90 second audio clips with Wampanoags describing things like a young person going off to college, an elder reflecting on the Pow Wow, the language reclamation project. So right now we're in the process of gathering those interviews.

- MS. STEPHENSON: What was the February date?
- MS. MOYNIHAN: I think it's February 11th.
 - MS. STEPHENSON: What happens on that date or what is that goal?
 - MS. MOYNIHAN: That's the installation date. And then we'll have a ribbon cutting in celebration in the early spring.
- MS. STEPHENSON: Oh, invite me.
- MS. MOYNIHAN: We will.
- 23 MS. STEPHENSON: Good. Okay

1.3

1.3

CLIMATE FRIENDLY PARKS

MR. PRICE: Rich had attended the climate friendly workshop that we held in May. And basically this is a program that was initiated in six operation between the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Park Service. And the goal was in an effort to mitigate climate change through education, communication, and action. And that first day was at the Salt Pond Visitor's Center and there were a number of presentations by a variety of people talking about the effects of climate change and then we proceeded to workshops where the various Parks that were there actually engaged in developing very specific plans. I've asked Megan Tyrrell from our Natural Resource Management program to kind of give us a synopsis or an overview of some of the things our staff presented specifically during that program.

MS. TYRRELL: Thanks very much for giving us some space on your agenda. I appreciate it. Our talk that we gave for this workshop was an hour long. So what I did was condense it down, cut a lot of things, but I'm also going to go very fast. So fasten your seatbelts.

(OFF THE RECORD SLIDE PRESENTATION BY MS. TYRRELL)

MR. DELANEY: Thank you. That was terrific.

MR. PRICE: Let me just follow up on some of the

other aspects of the Climate Friendly Park program. So the Park Service actually engaged a consultant and they've been going around the country recruiting parks.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Lauren, how many other -- do we have like three other parks at our workshop besides the Cape I believe.

Was anybody else there? Brenda, were you there? I can't remember if it was just Rich at that meeting.

As I said, this is a combination with EPA and MPS. It has a three prong approach; the parks that sign up for the measured park house space, greenhouse gas emission. Number two, develops a stable strategy to mitigate these emissions and adapt to climate change impacts and an action plan. And three, educate the public about these efforts. So we're in the process with this consultant and working on our action plan. And some of the goals include net zero energy towards carbon neutrality, achieving feasible car-free visits to the Cape. And obviously that's where we're trying to go with our public transportation initiatives with the county and with our bike trails and others. Neither exceed the mandates of the Executive Order that has to do with carbon. leading voice on impacts of climate change. Demonstrate Park successes to be an example to others. Promote concept of "Do your part" to visitors and surrounding

communities. Strive for continuous improvement.

Integrate sustainability into our Park policy practices and employee training and reinforcing and follow -- in our Park we came up with the motto, "One Park, One Team, Be Safe, Be Green".

So right now we have our consultants taking a look at the effect of the strategy that we developed and will be getting that back in the wintertime and will continue to be working on this with the Commission and with others in order to take a look at where we are with our energy management, our transportation, our waste management as well as our education outreach program.

MR. DELANEY: I did attend a workshop and I really wanted to have this on the agenda for two reasons. At least a summary of it, and an excellent one that Megan gave us. One is just because people here, organizations spending money on monitoring programs and don't understand why you need to collect data. But this is a dramatic example of how you can see trends from that data for even short periods of time and long periods of time even more so. And secondly, we're hearing a lot about climate change generically and generally. But this gives us a chance to begin to see the impacts of it right here in our own Park, and it's real.

So, thank you. That was an excellent summary. 1 Questions. Yes, Peter. 3 MR. WATTS: Megan, in that one example you gave, did you say that the Cape was the equivalent of New 4 5 Hampshire? MS. TYRRELL: No, I'm not in a form kind of way, but 6 7 just saying that was the example that I had to draw from. 8 So I thought it really helped us get a handle on how things may change here. 10 MR. WATTS: So if they change that much in New Hampshire, they could change that much on Cape Cod? 11 12 MS. TYRRELL: Right, right. 1.3 MR. DELANEY: You just stick Massachusetts on the 14 bottom of the New Hampshire map. 15 MS. TYRRELL: And drag it down, yeah. 16 MS. DELANEY: And drag it down. It's what I've seen 17 in early diagrams. But that's a pretty dramatic 18 illustration, isn't it? Have you ever seen that before? But even the low projections are pretty dramatic. 19 20 The high projections are -21 MS. TYRRELL: Scary. 22 MR. DELANEY: You know, scary. 23 MR. PRICE: And one of the things too with the storms

that I've been concerned about -- fortunately, I'm not

giving you a sad story to report about Hurricane/Tropical

Storm Earl as it came by. The good news was that our

staff had the opportunity to develop a full insulate

command system program. We activated all of our

divisions and we worked through the process, which made

it much more real. It wasn't just a tabletop exercise.

But when we talk about this -- according to what Graham

tells me, it's not that we'll get more storms on the Cape

necessarily. They will just come with a stronger force.

And when we talk about rain, I don't know about your

neighborhood, but down in Barnstable a friend of mine had

a rain gauge and he measured five inches of rain just in

a couple of those bands that came through.

(Off the record discussion)

MR. DELANEY: Dick.

1.3

MR. PHILBRICK: This has been very valuable to me because it reassures me that the Park Service and this Park are both believers in terms of Global Warming rather than doubters. Everywhere else they are around. And I hope that means that it's there to stay and it won't blow with some of the political winds.

MR. DELANEY: Thank you.

Yeah, Bill.

24 MR. HAMMATT: On that point. A pretty convincing

presentation, but what about the experts who think this is a lot of bunk, are they represented at these meetings so that -- I'd like to hear their point of opinion too. I mean, the EPA and the National Park Service at the meetings, do they invite the other opinion in?

MR. PRICE: Well, first of all. I was at a couple of conferences now with 300 scientists, they all share this opinion. I think their question is are those other people experts or do they just have their own opinion.

MR. HAMMATT: Every once in a while you read or hear from these people and just curious.

MR. DELANEY: Well Megan showed four or five reports; the original one being the inter-government panel on climate change. Those reports all get peer reviewed scientifically. So the scientific skeptics or questioners had a chance to critique the methodologies and the data. So when you go through a very rigorous process and survived, then I think the document and the data that this plan is based on is pretty solid at that point. That's one way that the skeptics get a chance to challenge the information, and they have. There have been ample opportunities for the peer review process.

MR. PRICE: I think the other thing that I see when I look at this is that a lot of what they're looking at --

I mean she referenced a lot of the forecasts down the road. But one of the issues that I take away from this is when you take a look at the tide chart in Boston, I mean that's a given. So unless you're cynical enough to believe that that is made-up data, it's there. We have the given data of the temperature change of all the changes in our ponds. We're posting the ponds now because of high mercury level, so we don't eat the fish. I mean all of these things have happened. We've had a lot of this coastal change. So, you know it's one thing, you know to maybe take a pot shot at the future predictions, but it's another thing to actually see of the underground example.

1.3

I actually have two other items which I didn't post that. Unless you have other questions for me.

MR. DELANEY: No. If no more questions are made, let's move on.

MR. PRICE: One is this morning, the Advisory

Commission we had a small field trip up to the Province

Science Visitor's center and that was to review an

exhibit that has been installed through the efforts of

NOA and with regards to Gary Studds Stellwagen Bank

National Marine Sanctuary. And it's a very exciting

exhibit, I think. It's got realtime data from sound

buoys off the coast of the Cape actually tracking vessels in realtime. And then the sound buoys will pick up the sounds of the right whales when they're in the vicinity. And the next step will be that this system will then broadcast back to the ships that are in the shipping channels where the whales and their particular location. The ultimate goal is to try to reduce whale strikes.

1.3

You all will receive an invitation to a public ribbon cutting that they're going to be hosting; they being the Stellwagen Bank. We will be co-sponsoring the hosting with them on September 24th on a Friday, and that's coming up. I spoke with Craig MacDonald, who is the superintendent of the sanctuary, who's very excited about this. This is unique in the country for this type of a coverage. So at our facility we have a receiver system from the buoys. We have the exhibit and then they'll be using our facility to broadcast out to the ships. And this is a triangulation system with Scituate — and what's the name of the other Park?

MS. MOYNIHAN: Halibut Point.

MR. PRICE: Halibut Point, which is up near Rockport. So it's a triangulated system and it's all focused through our visitor's center.

The other item which we've talked about briefly in

the past. We'll be sending out an invitation to the kick-off of our 50th anniversary planning meeting. And I'd like to give you all a gift.

1.3

Sue, why don't you tell them what this gift is.

MS. MOYNIHAN: For your reading pleasure. This is a book that was written by a local author. His name is Dan Lombardo. Some of you may know Dan who lives here in Wellfleet. He was under contract to Arcadia Press. The cover of the book might look familiar to you. It's similar to books that a lot of the towns have with the sepia cover, that historical finish. The series of books is called, "Images of America". And this one is largely photographs with the captions and it represents a number of historic images from the first 50 years of the National Seashore which was established in 1961. It goes beyond that -- excuse me, in advance of that to sort of set the stage for seashore cultural and natural resources.

MS. BOLEYN: That's wonderful.

MR. DELANEY: That's great.

MR. PRICE: So we wanted to give you all members of the Advisory Commission a copy. For everybody else including me, they're for sale in our bookstore. But it's really a nice compilation. I know Bill Burke worked

with the author. But I think they did a nice job.

MR. WATTS: I've been trying to buy this George.

Thank you for the gift.

MR. PRICE: You're welcome.

Mr. Chairman, that's all.

MR. DELANEY: Yes, that's very good. Thank you. And let's move now to old business.

OLD BUSINESS

MR. DELANEY: Any members of the Commission like to raise an issue from old business? Okay.

New business?

1.3

NEW BUSINESS

MR. PHILBRICK: I don't know if mine is old nor new.

MR. DELANEY: Middle ground business. Go ahead, Dick.

MR. PHILBRICK: On the subject of turbines and you lump it with cell phone towers. But on that subject, I have been hearing a lot of propaganda, I guess, campaigning against these things. And I've seen a lot of data being brought about the effect of sound on people from turbines - wind turbines on land. And I'm wondering if the staff of the Park here in the actual Advisory Board we sat on has received any of the good science which has been developed on this subject of the possible harm from sound from wind turbines. Because I think I

see very little of it being referred to in terms of data. The data simply says there is hardly any harm. And I hear just the opposite from campaigning groups who are loudly proclaiming there is harm.

I want to make sure that we all the best of the advice on this we can get including the pure science.

Thank you.

1.3

MR. DELANEY: Okay. Thanks, Dick. Comments on that point from Commission members or any further discussion on that business.

Brenda?

MS. BOLEYN: Well, I certainly agree with Dick. I think there is a lot of information out there. And if we get into this subject, we're going to need to find the most respective science and peered reviewed science that we can on the issue. There's no question about that. I learned the other day that the Cape Cod Community College has had a proposal to build a wind turbine as part of its environmental technology program on the campus and it was denied by the historic commission. But they're actually going to court over this, which is very interesting and unusual. But it occurred to me that would be a good place to find out what kind of background information to use.

MR. PHILBRICK: I wonder if we shouldn't ask to schedule some presentations on the subject you just raised and insofar as education at an early meeting.

MR. DELANEY: Well, it's very possible. You know that we have in our packet today another set of correspondence from groups that are demonstrating reports and statements that show the harmful side of it. You're suggesting there are yet more reports and studies that could balance that decision or that opinion, and perhaps we should have a full hearing at some point. That's a discussion among the Commission members or the superintendent, you might want to comment on that suggestion.

MR. PRICE: Well I think the most significant comment that I have that I've learned from the observations is that it depends. And the depend part is — it depends on where you're locating it and what size you're talking about. Because there appears to a great variation in the actual experience and even the scientific doubt because these turbines come in various sizes. You have the one, for instance, the 100 footer that might be at the Mass Maritime compared to the 400 foot one that Wellfleet was discussing. So it comes from a very different place. When we had our scientist and sound people out at Denver

take a review of the Wellfleet information, their feedback to us was that they hadn't collected enough sample data, and part of it had to do with the type of machine it was, where it was located, what the prevalent winds were, where was the closest occupant. So those are all variables. So I'm not sure we'll come up with a one size fits all for sure because these things are very, very different depending on where they're located. That's been my observation so far.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. DELANEY: Wellfleet alternate, yes, sir.

MR. REINHART: I mentioned this last month, but the Seashore -- it's not just about the scientific data, it's about the aesthetics of the Seashore preserving the landscape and the appearance of the landscape. And to me, it's an industrialization. These are industrial size machines. I wouldn't have an objection to something on a smaller scale, but I just am really against introducing something of that kind of mass and scale to our landscape here and especially at the Seashore. This is a Park. And I don't think the Park, personally is the place to be producing large quantities of energy. It's just not -they don't go hand in hand. Park means preserve nature to me. So I don't want us to get into too much involvement with scientific data and forget the whole

aesthetic thing which is more from the heart, you know.

And we all love the Seashore or we wouldn't be sitting

here right now.

MR. DELANEY: It's clear from our past discussions there are two major issues; the scientific set of data on human and health impacts and environmental impacts versus the aesthetics of the Park. And I guess the other theme that reoccurs is how does the Park responsibly respond to this climate change trend we see here. So there's a least three pieces to this discussion that I see and they're all very complicated and they are interrelated. And I think George is right, it depends on which situation we're talking about.

Other comments from the Committee.

Okay, let's continue then to -- well I was on intermediate business, not into new business. Any new issues to bring up?

(No response)

1.3

DATE AND AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

All right, then a date and agenda items for the next meeting which would typically be in November. If we stick with Mondays, what are our options?

MR. PRICE: Looking at -- I would say either November 8th or November 15th would be the likely dates.

MS. BOLEYN: I can't do the 8th. 1 2 MR. DELANEY: 8th, there is one problem. I'm okay on 3 both dates. Anyone else have a major conflict? Let's 4 suggest the --I'm sorry, Bill, what? 5 MR. HAMMATT: I can't do the 15th. 6 7 MR. DELANEY: Any other... 8 MR. PRICE: Well, the 22nd is the week of Thanksgiving. I don't know if folks would want to do 10 that. 11 MR. DELANEY: What about the 1st, is that out of the 12 question? 1.3 MR. PHILBRICK: December? 14 MR. DELANEY: No, I'm moving back to November 1st. 15 MS. BOLEYN: Yeah, I won't be here. 16 MR. HAMMATT: Want to write the 15th? 17 MR. DELANEY: Alright, stick with the 15th then? Alright. Thanks, Bill for understanding. We'll go with 18 19 the 15th. Any particular items in addition to our standard 20 21 Superintendent's report and other updates that people 22 would like to see on that agenda?

MR. SABIN: In line with this whale observation

23

24

Ed?

situation, could we get involved any more in that. I would really like to see some statistics on the number of whales we're actually talking about hurting. I mean to spend several million dollars to save one whale is one thing. If we're talking about, you know, 50 whales a year, that's a bigger deal. I'd like to know how big the problem is.

1.3

MR. PRICE: That was a question that was asked more on our field trip. So we were surmising, Sue and I recall that there has been as many as 200 right whales up here at any one time, which we understood is almost two-thirds of the population. And yet the question was, well, how many strikes actually happen. And we just don't have that information.

MR. DELANEY: If you would like a full report on any and all of these aspects, my colleagues at the Center of Coastal Studies will be happy to give you a full presentation rather than me starting to pick up some numbers, I mean we could present it and that could be an item for the agenda on the 15th. Okay?

MR. PHILBRICK: Is it too soon to hope for a presentation of what I call, pure science on the sound issue with turbines?

MR. DELANEY: Well, let's see. This is a big topic

as we just got through saying to each other, how we might bring that forward.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PRICE: Personally, Dick, I quess my approach has been similar to previous even -- it seems to me we can really spend our time when we have a project on the table. Because if you have a project on the table, then you know the size, you know the projected location, you know the specs of the equipment. And I know that's the only way our people -- our sound people in Denver are going to be able to relate to something. Other than that, I'm just feeling that we're going to go down a rabbit hole of a lot of different possibilities. sure how we could zero in on something unless we had a particular project. That's been my approach on it. Otherwise, we could get -- we could get a bunch of people and we'll probably have opposing opinions and opposing views and everything else. I'm not sure if that's worth the time.

MR. DELANEY: If we view ourselves as on a learning curve that will probably continue for sometime as future wind turbine projects are proposed, then we have been and I'm sure our public commentary will be supplied with more studies -- citations for studies on some of the harmful impacts. Perhaps one staff assignment without a whole

lot of time and effort, but even for ourselves, might compile a list of other studies that we may know about. Dick, you may know of some. Lauren, you and your staff may be aware of some. So we at least can build kind of a database that we can refer to. Not have presentations on each of these studies, but we could have a list of relevant studies in union for -- of concerned scientists that was referred to in this climate change. I know those reports, site reports that they think are -- have been peer reviewed and are good science, the kind of science that you're looking for Dick. Maybe we could at least start to build a set of studies on both sides of the argument.

MR. PHILBRICK: That's exactly what I would like to see happen.

MR. DELANEY: Okay. I think that would be an assignment for all of us and for Park. So that can come forward and we can cite and have that available for future discussions, if and when we have a specific project in front of us.

MR. PRICE: Well I would add to that Dick, besides the human impact of sound, the other critical issue that would be something that we would take a look at out here for sure would be the impact on the natural resources and

specifically bird and bat migration. And in talking to some of our colleagues at USGS and BOEM, I think some of them already have some of those reports.

1.3

Megan, at this last meeting I was at the Chief Environmental officer for BOEM was at the meeting. And I know they were looking at a lot of the European models for instance. So there's a lot of stuff out there, the question is how much effort do we put on it to really do a comprehensive versus if we had a real project, is my concern.

MR. DELANEY: That's why I approached it with -- like I don't think there should be all consuming for staff because they have a lot of things to do, but should be mindful. One place we can start right away is -- I'm sorry I don't know the name of the coalition on Cape Cod that has had several workshops where they have also brought medical -- doctors who have commented on opposition to the doctors that have been cited in having impacts - negative impacts.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}$. MCKEAN: That other one has been posted on there, we can compile that.

MR. DELANEY: We can find them. But there are organizations on Cape Cod that have brought together panels of medical experts who have presented testimony

that counters some of the stuff we've learned at public commentary. That will be one place we can start building the other set of reports.

MR. PHILBRICK: In the same way that we will need to look at the impact on natural resources of turbines, we must continue to watch the impact on natural resources of global warming. And they are related because wind is the major source for renewable energy that's around. There's some (inaudible) out there and there's a few other lesser ones, but it is the major true source and the energy collected from the sun over the whole surface of the earth. And that's a big collector.

MR. DELANEY: Thank you for keeping us focused on this issue.

Peter?

1.3

MR. WATTS: I was encouraged by the information about offshore wind generation. I wonder if there will be an update that will be available in November on state and federal findings on that.

MR. DELANEY: I don't know where your group will be at that point, George.

MR. PRICE: I don't know if they'll have an RFI out for public distribution yet. At the meetings I've attended there's been members of the public there, but it

hasn't been a FACA committee. It's all been state and locally they're elected or government officials. They're were certainly members of the public and press at the meetings, but all the material that has been distributed including the maps are listed as not for public distribution. But certainly when they get out under their RFI and their federal register, we can certainly take a look at it then.

1.3

MR. DELANEY: And I know the Cape Cod Commission process will be under way by November and may even have some preliminary hearings and opportunities for presentation. I think short of a full presentation, we should at least have a full update on where these three processes stand.

MR. PRICE: The Cape Cod Commission process is about which area?

MS. MCKEAN: The District of Critical Planning concerned with of course the ocean and the bay.

MR. PRICE: But the state waters?

MS. MCKEAN: State waters, yes.

MR. PRICE: And then there's even another whole initiative that I think is very exciting and we'd have to get someone involved. But one of the other topics that comes out of this joint DOI and NOA discussion also has

initiative. And they're partnered with states on that and that would be a really good presentation to get someone who can talk about it without stumbling over themselves like I would if I tried to mimic some of the discussions that I've heard. But that's something else that's going to affect Massachusetts and Rhode Island quite a bit. And NOA is already involved with this and it's also gotten quite controversial because of perceived impacts on the fishing industry. But that's something that I know -- we've got a superintendent's conference coming up and that's going to be a hot topic of all the Parks that are on the seaboard

MR. DELANEY: Well, you know Massachusetts started ——
it has created the first ocean plan, ie., Marine Spacial
Planning in the nation. Senator Leary signed that bill,
it's already been completed. And then President Obama in
June issued an Executive Order that instructed federal
agencies to basically replicate the same process in
federal waters, which is what you're referring to as
Marine Spacial Planning.

MR. PRICE: Yes.

1.3

MR. DELANEY: So we have been at the forefront. My center has been involved quite a bit in that. I have a

fair amount of experience. So if that's a topic of interest, I'd be happy to include that and update you on Marine Spacial Planning as well.

MS. STEPHENSON: Is this the ocean energy water?

MR. DELANEY: There's more than ocean. This is more than energy. This is comprehensive uses of our ocean surface complete; aqua culture, cable crossings, energy siting, fishing restrictions, fishing areas, recreational sailing, boating. It's like doing a zoning plan for the ocean. It's pretty ambitious. But the President has put in motion by regions; northeast, mid Atlantic, southeast, the directive to all federal agencies to put state with joining states to create such plans. Very interesting initiative.

Bill.

MR. HAMMATT: You've got carrying capacity as well?

MR. DELANEY: Yes. Oh, yeah. We starting to get

into it, but the challenge is there is so much data that

is really required in order to make good decisions and we

don't have planning decisions or ocean use decisions and

that data has really been lacking for years. And we

haven't focused on what's appropriate for the oceans,

what are the conditions. But there are honestly places

where wind or energy facilities make sense, some places

where they don't. Some places where large scale aqua culture would be appropriate than not. And there are conflicting uses already growing.

George.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PRICE: One of the things in that presentation I just saw, they're combining -- I mentioned the task force in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. And Rhode Island has already gone down this road quite a bit and they've used their own state money mapping the ocean bottom even into federal waters around Block Island and up to the Massachusetts border. And they went through a presentation of all the things that they're taking a look at and it's very, very, impressive. I believe the total was something like \$7 million over a number of years because what they were trying to anticipate is where they could have offshore wind turbines. So they were putting overlays of primary fishing grounds of any critical fish habitats, any shallow reefs. They even went into the sediment of the soil as to where it would be feasible to construct something or not. So, it's a very, very comprehensive review. And I know the Massachusetts task force isn't even close to that yet. But they're taking a look at a large area --

MR. DELANEY: On the federal one, but -

- 1 MR. PRICE: On the federal one.
 - MR. DELANEY: But if you look at the state -- if you google, Massachusetts Ocean Plan, and access that and spend some time with it, a lot of those databases have been created for state waters.
- 6 MR. PRICE: State waters, you're right.
- 7 MR. DELANEY: Brenda.

2

3

5

8

10

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

- MS. BOLEYN: I just wanted to ask George... The Rhode Island project, is the University doing that or is it out of state agencies?
- 11 MR. PRICE: Well, primarily it's the state agencies
 12 that's the point person for it, but yes, they're working
 13 with URI.
 - MR. DELANEY: It's being led by their coastal zone management agency. It's Coastal Resources Management, it's called.
- 17 MR. PRICE: Right.
- 18 MR. DELANEY: Yes.
 - MR. REINHART: Is there any of these regional sort of conferences that you know of? Are there email lists or anything that would help us to learn more about this -- that somebody like me could attend? You know you talked about some of the things as well.
- 24 MR. DELANEY: Of course the Massachusetts plan has

gone through its first iteration and you can use that
website that I mentioned just a minute ago. The new
regional federal initiatives that are coming from the
Obama Executive Order are just getting launched and they
haven't -- but there will be plenty of public hearings
and opportunity for input, I'm sure. One of the major
premise of a marine spacial plan is to bring the user
groups together to sort out conflicting uses and bring
the scientists together to provide the best possible
science. So it will be a very transparent process.

Okay, so we have an agenda that's developing rapidly for November. Good.

Any other items for that agenda?

(No response)

1.3

And we have the date.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. DELANEY: And now I'd like to move to public comment. And as always, we ask people to be concise and not repetitive if someone else has made a similar comment before.

Yes, please. Identify yourself for the stenographer.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. RICE: Jim Rice, Wellfleet and Sandwich. George, don't you already have a specific

proposal on the table for wind?

MR. PRICE: No, we have -

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. RICE: There's nothing at Highland?

MR. PRICE: We have a project -- a concept of having wind turbines up at the Highland Center, but we don't have any height, we don't have any number, we don't have a location.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. RICE: Wouldn't you want to know whether that turbine, whatever height they're putting up, a noise assaults people even now?

MR. PRICE: If we knew the height, then we'll go through that process.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. RICE: I just would like to suggest one other thing. Besides aesthetics and besides science, there are people who hear -- I've been to Falmouth -- it lies on Sharp Road in Falmouth. A lot of the people who supported the turbine are now being driven to distraction by it. I think if you invited these people here, you'd find they're not lying, they're not exaggerating, they're very believable.

I've been to Vinyl Haven, Maine and I've heard the turbine there too. So I think in addition to the science, in addition to the aesthetics, there's a version

of what real people actually hear, very believable who supported wind turbines before one was put in their backyard.

And I think that at long last, isn't it time for a sub-committee here on wind. I know it's been mentioned in the past when Wellfleet was supposedly proposing a turbine and it was dropped. And it was mentioned the last time, I think between me and Richard. But isn't time there be a sub-committee formed as a part of this Advisory Commission?

MR. DELANEY: I think right at this point, every member of this Commission is interested at this point. We have plenty of opportunity for people to discuss it. I'm keeping it on the table for the full Commission membership so far. I will -- if and when we get to a specific project that needs a lot more time, like we did recently with the dune shacks, we will -- I would consider it a sub-committee at that point. But it's still a possibility, still something I will consider. I'd like to gear it to a specific project.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. RICE: I'd like to thank -- I don't know your name, sir, but thank you very much for making this suggestion. I think it's very important that the science get out. I think it's very important that

the aesthetics be brought up. It's very important that what people hear be part of this discussion. Thank you.

MR. DELANEY: Thank you. Other comments from the public. Yes, sir.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. BIDLER: I have a comment to make, just briefly. I want to make one suggestion.

MR. DELANEY: For the stenographer.

1.3

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. BIDLER: I'm sorry, Eric Bidler, Weston, Connecticut. Very briefly with respect to resources with scientific evidence and so forth. We did hang out to the Committee the issue of Park Science Magazine from November and December of last year the entire issue was devoted to management of the sound scape. That entire issue was put together by the National Sounds program, this group that the superintendent referred to.

You also have in your possession a copy of a letter that Mr. Price sort of wrote a cover paragraph I think. And then also this letter that emanated from them with their findings on the Wellfleet acoustics study. And all of their concerns about sound from wind turbines as they might relate to sound scape of the Park. Included in that letter and also included in the issue, which you have a copy of -- included in the issue of *Park Science*

Magazine, you'll find they provide an extensive bibliography of articles, scientific, peer reviewed articles, some of which relate to impacts on wildlife. And this whole issue of the impact of chronic noise -- I mean one of your own scientists here in that group published this landmark article on the effects of chronic noise and to wildlife. And Mr. Price referred to and continually refers to and continually refers to the impact of sound on nearby residents. But the fact of the matter is, we rarely hear in this room any sort of concern for the effect on wildlife. And you know this is a natural landscape and so -- I think you should consider all of those things in addition. And we'd be happy to provide you with a lot of additional information. So I just want to offer that. But that wasn't my comment.

What I wanted to say today was first of all, I want to compliment all of the employees and the Commission members here for all the efforts that you make to address the issues and consider the issues that affect the management of the Park. I think sometimes we forget that we all have common objectives and we have a common love for this Park and we all want to basically accomplish the same thing. I think that we don't always agree on the means to accomplish, you know, the objectives that we all

want. I think that's understandable. I think it's also true that we don't always agree on facts underlying the management of these problems. And I think that's quite unfortunate.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I saw a reference -- I was interested to see the reference on the slide to the two lines, one of which I think was the line leading to inconvenient truths and the other line led to reassuring lies. And I think one issue that everybody in this room is interested in is global warming. And I think all of us in this room, most of us, believe that that line of the door for reassuring lies, if you're a global warming denialist, those reassuring lies are, you know there's nothing to worry about, you know we don't have to consider this a real problem, that kind of thing. But there's another line and I believe the evidence is very compelling that a lot of us with good intentions are lining up another line of reassuring lies and those are, you know, people who consider themselves environmentalists who believe that we can solve our problems through, you know some of these alternative energy sources. And I don't really want to call them reassuring lies. I really think it's more appropriate to call them -- maybe there's a third door. And that third door is wishful thinking. It's good

intentions run amuck. And it's good intentions and wishful thinking that are not supported by sound scientific evidence. Now we've provided a lot of evidence in this room that there's some pretty unclear thinking going on in here. I mean one example would be the idea that one wind turbine in Wellfleet, which would be one of 1,300 that might have some impact on placing a small power plant is going to solve your problem of rising sea level or beach erosion or that sort of thing.

Tom Reinhart alluded to the fact that we shouldn't confuse our energy policy with the management of our Park. We've made this point repeatedly. And I keep coming back to this room and this Commission keeps confusing those issues as if a wind turbine in a National Park, which will spoil the landscape, is the solution to global warming. So I want to make that point.

Finally, just to sum it up. You know I've provided you with a letter, it's dated today. I'm not going to get the bullet points. I hope you'll all read it. It addresses some specific issues that have come up recently. It includes extensive excerpts from a letter of one of the superintendent's close counterparts where a deputy division -- deputy regional director of the National Park Service wrote a letter strenuously

objecting to the introduction of industrial wind turbines within five miles of the boundary of this Park because of the industrialization of the scene and the -- you know the impact that would have and how that was completely unacceptable. And he goes on to note that these few sets may be subjective, but they're not purely subjective.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now I think there's an over arching problem in this I've read all your minutes going back five years. I've come to all your meetings in the last calendar year and you are embarking on your examination of this problem with wind turbines specifically with -- wind turbines. You're adopting a premise -- you reason from a faulty premise. You begin by saying, it's not a question of if we should have wind turbines in this Park, it's where to put them, and what kind, and how big they should be, and that kind of thing. And in fact, underlying that there are two extremely faulty premises. One of them is that the wind turbines that you would condone or fail to object to in the case of Wellfleet or Eastham or other places, first you assume that they work. Meaning -- I mean specifically, you've outlined specific objectives and you assume they will accomplish those objectives that you see. I address some of that in this letter. You really need to think hard about that.

But more importantly, you all assume apparently by 1 your failure to object in principal to wind turbines in Wellfleet, Eastham, Highlands Park -- Highlands Center --3 sorry. No one in this room has held this discussion or objected to the appropriateness of this sort of 5 industrialization in the Park, you have accepted that at 6 7 face value. And in my letter I note that the 8 Superintendent and Park planner have given us -- for example, have suggested that other national parks face 10 the same issue and that this is going on around the system. Of all those other projects the next largest 11 12 project to Wellfleet -- Wellfleet was about 18 times as big. So that was the next largest project. And all the 13 14 other windmills within national parks, Wellfleet was 300 15 or 500 or 800 or 1200 times as big. You're out there all 16 by yourselves in terms of this idea of putting these 17 industrial machines in the National Park. The National Park Conservation Association has said it's 18 inappropriate. The Selectmen in the Town of Wellfleet, 19 20 but not your representative here from Wellfleet, have 21 come out in public and said they're inappropriate in the 22 National Park.

The guidelines for the Federal Advisory Committee have said they're inappropriate in conservation issues.

23

24

And you're ducking the issue. You won't even talk about it. So I think you need to go back to square one. Instead of asking yourself -- instead of saying that it's not a question of if we should have one, but where to put them. You need to ask yourselves -- and restate the question, we think it's not a question of where you should put them, it's a question if these things belong in national parks. And you better start with the fundamental question, then you don't need to worry about noise or wildlife or all these other aspects. Start by asking in principle, should we be putting up 30-story towers at Highland Center, 40-story towers at Wellfleet. You know it's that easy.

So I charge you all. You know, I don't know whether any or all of you agree with the Park management. The Chairman is silent. The Commission members are silent. You don't discuss it. You don't air on your views. There's no sense as to whether you're all falling into line here and you're all in agreement or whether you're all just trying to get up the curve. But the time has come. You can see that there's an awful lot of difference of opinion. And I think the Commission has to ask themselves how they -- and individual members should come out in public and discuss this issue. And Mr.

Chairman, I respectfully ask that you should foster this discussion at the next meeting and ask people to air their views out. Thank you very much.

MR. DELANEY: Okay. Thank you. We will note that we've had this topic discussed at some lengths many, many times thanks to your perseverance, but....

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. BIDLER: Not appropriateness.

MR. DELANEY: But we will continue.

1.3

MS. BOLEYN: Well I was going to say you started off your last comment by declaring the flawed premise. Your premise is that there should be no wind turbines in any Park anywhere in the country. And I think that's a flawed premise. I think you need to look at these things. And as the Superintendent has said, we can talk in bland generalities about wind turbines, but unless we have a specific location and a specific project, it's pretty hard to charge a sub-committee to deal with the issue.

MR. SABIN: I agree. I object to the charges that are made by this particular person over and over again, which are not well founded.

MR. DELANEY: Okay. We'll continue with public comments. Please identify yourself.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MS. GREEN: Thank you, Chairman. I

appreciate it. Lilly Green, Wellfleet. And I just want to reply first before my public comments to some of the comments that you have made around the table especially about gathering information. I applaud you for bringing up the topic of wind turbines and discussing it as you have briefly today. And or you, Chairman Delaney, for planning to develop a database. I do have a lot of information. In fact, I put together a binder of information. Our state representative here, Sarah Peake called for a meeting with the Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Health, John Auerbach and I attended that meeting. I put together a six-inch binder with materials, many scientific articles and reports, peer reviewed articles, NIH scientists, etcetera. And I would be glad to provide that to the Park Service as part of your database.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And to that other question that was brought here by a member of your Commission today. There actually is an international conference on wind turbine noise in October. And many scientists will be speaking on that very topic and I can provide you with the date and the location. It's in Canada. I know that there are very respectable scientists that will be speaking at that committee. Would it be appropriate to send that

information to you? Chairman Delaney, you would provide that to your other members?

MR. DELANEY: Sure. Thank you. Yes.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MS. GREEN: And also there is a group here on the Cape and islands we are forming it's called CARE, it's Cape and Islands Alliance for Realistic Energy. And this group will be -- is forming in the last few weeks and will be sponsoring a series of lectures at four C's, the college, at the end of September. Starting September into October and going on. And one of the speakers will be a very reputable scientist. But it will be a different point of view than perhaps other lectures have been here on the Cape at this point in time.

I'm all for education and I would like people to look at the information, read it, critically think about it and come to your own conclusion. That's all I ask.

And I've done a lot of research and I keep on giving you some additional information and I did send Chairman

Delaney a letter -- an email and it did have two new articles in it; one that came out yesterday and one that came out last week for the Commission members. I don't know if you've had a chance to give it to the members. I don't think you did, so I did make some copies.

So there's one article in here, it's from Denmark.

And Denmark is turning against wind turbines. You know they're -- I think for a lot of different reasons. And also there's one about radar and the -- and we know Truro has -- we're our first line defense. I mean that's what I learned when I had training for the Park Service. So I think there's a big battle between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy here. I mean there's a lot of really serious, very critical issues that I think are really important for everybody to look at and everybody to really critically think about. And I would ask you to please read this information and think about it as you have further conversation and discussions about this.

1.3

So I would like to start my comments for today. I would like to say that $\mbox{-}$

MR. DELANEY: Lilly, just so you know that you're email did already get into this packet that we already have. So be assured that it was distributed to everybody even yesterday when we could send it.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MS. GREEN: Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't realize that. Okay, well I wanted to make sure everybody had that because I thought there were two really important articles there. And you know we have been asking for you to discuss this issue at length. And

I'm glad that you're making steps in that direction. But I really hope that you will consider having a hearing or having a full conversation about this.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

My point is that why in the National Park should we wait until there is a specific project in a specific location. This takes money. It takes tax payer dollars. It takes a lot of time and effort to go forth with this. When the mission of the National Park and the purpose of this Park clearly state, I believe, that an industrial grade wind turbine is inappropriate for this Park. mean it just sincerely is. If you really read the mission of the Park and the purpose of the Park, you cannot put industrial turbines in this Park. And I think that's really the bottom line. Especially in times of economic hardship to spend all this money of our tax payer dollars to hire consulting firms to go after the FAA, when the FAA has already said that it can be only zero feet high. I mean this is a threat to national security in fact. I mean there's so many reasons. nearest resident is only a quarter of a mile away. think that there is conclusive evidence that 1.24 miles or two kilometers away is the nearest location for anyone -- any person to reside without having health risks to humans with the industrial grade wind turbines.

believe that you as Commission should really seriously discuss this. And I've also asked Chairman Delaney and I've asked before that you start a sub-committee to look into this Highlands Center. It already has structures. They already have a footprint. There are so many ways that we may be able to save energy. I've asked George Price in a meeting that we had with him in the spring, just set up a sub-committee with members of the Commission and members of volunteers from the community to look into ways to make that area sustainable without even wind turbines. Use the footprint that's already And I believe you really can make a big difference, if not have that area completely sustainable without changing the footprint that's already there. So I would ask you Chairman Delaney, to really seriously consider doing that.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I do think that the evidence is overwhelming.

If you do the research it is hard to believe that you won't conclude what I've come to understand in just the past six months. There are dire consequences for sighting wind turbines in Cape Cod National Seashore.

And as citizens of the lower Cape, we've tried to educate you on what little we have, the Advisory Commission why wind turbines are not appropriate for the National Park.

And I believe it's your responsibility to represent the local community here on Cape and make your voices heard here with George Price and with the Cape Cod National Seashore and with Washington as well.

1.3

Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans and Harwich all have said no to wind turbines in our community. It is my belief that it is your responsibility to say no to the National Park Service here on Cape Cod and no to Washington. Wind turbines are just not appropriate for Cape Cod National Seashore. And I thank you for allowing my comments.

MR. DELANEY: Okay. Thank you, Lilly.

Okay. Other comments from the public.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. BIDLER: I have a question.

MR. DELANEY: Yes, sir, go ahead.

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. BIDLER: I guess my question is I know that you're the appointee from the Department of Interior. And it never seems to go anywhere, but the wind turbine guidelines you know do have this scared system for decision-making. And there is a philosophy behind that. But the philosophy of those wind turbine guidelines is -- the whole intent for having the guidelines -- what made it -

MR. DELANEY: What's the question?

(AUDIENCE MEMBER) MR. BIDLER: Well the question is because that intent is to begin by determining whether or not a location is appropriate to save all this kind of angst and on the taxpayer money and all lawsuits and that kind of thing, the intent of the guidelines is to say, look, start by asking yourself is it a conservation area, is it an appropriate location, you know, should it be here. That's where that starts. That's the wind turbine quidelines from the Federal Advisory Commission of the Department of Interior. The National Park Conservation Association in parallel to that, when I discussed this with them said, you know all we really needed to know was that it was completely out of scale with the National Seashore. They said to me, why did you even bother talking about all the other issues.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now we all know the National Parks Conservation

Association. I think we all have a lot of respect for
them. Why must we have a specific project before we
determine that a 300 foot tower is completely out of
scale and out of character with the natural landscape and
the historic character of Cape Cod. Why is that -- this
group's approach, which is in total contradiction to the
enabling legislation, first of all, and also the
Department of Interior.

MR. DELANEY: The answer is to both your points where 1 2 you would like -- I think all three comments are you would like us to make a unilateral statement that we are 3 opposed to wind turbines in this Park and this group, I don't believe is ready to make that kind of extreme 5 statement because of lots of complex trends and issues 6 7 that are in motion. You heard about ponds being 8 acidified in the National Park, that's a natural resource that we need to protect. Against the climate change --10 we've been through this conversation before and I'm not going to prolong this meeting now, but you're asking us 11 12 to go to the other extreme of doing a blanket rejection 1.3 of a renewable energy source is not responsible either. 14 So I think we, as a group, so far, unless my members want 15 to correct me, are taking a deliberate thoughtful 16 approach to these big important topics from climate 17 change to Park management to natural resources to 18 aesthetics and try and weigh all the possibilities. So yes, we may be on a learning curve. But we have given 19 20 everybody, your comments particularly, Eric, lots of 21 weight and we will continue to do so as we go forward. 22 But I have not seen a point yet where we have a specific decision to be made. We are close to that with the 23 Wellfleet proposal, but that was withdrawn. As the 24

1	Superintendent pointed out, the Truro proposal is not
2	right yet either. It's a concept that's being considered
3	as part of a whole plan of greening the Park, the climate
4	green parks, our initiative. The President and the
5	Department of Interior is asking everybody, Park
6	Superintendents, park visitors, individuals, citizens of
7	the United States to consider what we can do
8	collectively, independently as a Park and elsewhere to
9	address this issue. So it's I"m not resisting your
10	initiative, we welcome your thoughts and your comments.
11	But I am going to resist narrowing it down to a yes or no
12	question on a park-wide basis unless I hear differently
13	from my fellow members.
14	MS. STEPHENSON: No.
15	MR. PHILBRICK: Not from me.
16	MS. BOLEYN: Me either.
17	MR. DELANEY: Okay. Thank you.
18	<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>
19	Hearing no other public comments, I would ask for a
20	motion to adjourn.
21	BOARD MEMBERS: So moved.
22	MR. DELANEY: Second it.
23	BOARD MEMBERS: Second

MR. DELANEY: All those in favor?

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DELANEY: Motion carries.

3

1

2

4 (Whereupon, at 3:07 p.m. the proceedings

5 were adjourned.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

PLYMOUTH, SS

I, <u>Jo-Anne M. Golden</u>, a Court Reporter and Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that:

The foregoing 76 pages comprises a true, complete, and accurate transcript to the best of my knowledge, skill, and ability of the proceedings of the meeting of the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission at Marconi Station Area, Park Headquarters, South Wellfleet, Massachusetts, on Monday, September 13, 2020, commencing at 1:06 p.m.

I further certify that I am a disinterested person to these proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this 12th day of October, 2010.

Jo-Anne M. Golden - Court Reporter My commission expires: November 14, 2014